REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed January 15, 2008. Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 41 – 78 remain pending. In particular, Applicants add claims 41 – 78 and cancel claims 1 – 40 without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer. Applicants cancel claims 1 – 40 merely to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims in the present application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of these canceled claims in a continuing application, if Applicants so choose, and do not intend to dedicate the canceled subject matter to the public. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

I.   Objections to the Drawings

The Office Action indicates that the drawings are objected to as allegedly failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because FIG. 1 does not include a "YES" path from block 114. Applicants respectfully traverse this objection for at least the reason that the specification indicates "[i]f some configuration (e.g., subsystem) is marked as active then the network adapter device then determines whether the active configuration matches the configuration selected by the host in step 114. If so, no action is taken" (page 7, line 3). As illustrated, if the decision at block 114 is "YES," no action is taken. Consequently, there is nowhere to a direct a "YES" path. As such, Applicants respectfully traverse this objection and request reconsideration of this issue.

15

II. Claim Objections

The office action objects to the numbering of claims 6 and 29. Applicants cancel claims 1 – 40, its indicated above, thus rendering this issue moot.

III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102 – Claims 7, 10, 18, 21, 30, 33, 36, and 38 is Allowable Over *Microsoft*

The Office Action indicates that claims 7, 10, 18, 21, 30, 33, 36, and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by USB Remote NDIS Devices and Windows ("*Microsoft*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection on the grounds that *Microsoft* does not disclose, teach, or suggest all of the claimed elements. However, Applicants cancel these claims, thus rendering this issue moot.

IV. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

A. Claims 1 and 13 are Allowable Over *Microsoft* further in view of *Brownell, Brady, and Thomas*

The Office Action indicates that claims 1 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over USB Remote NDIS Devices and Windows ("*Microsoft*") further in view of Non-Patent Literature USB Host to Host Links ("*Brownell*"), U.S. Patent Publication Number 2003/0208579 A1 ("*Brady*"), and U.S. Patent Number 6,061,692 ("*Thomas*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Microsoft* further in view of *Brownell, Brady,* and *Thomas* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claims 1 and 13. However, Applicants cancel these claims, thus rendering this issue moot.

B. Claims 2 – 3, 14 – 15, and 24 – 26 are Allowable Over *Microsoft* further in view of *Brownell, Brady, and Thomas*

The Office Action indicates that claims 2 – 3, 14 – 15, and 24 – 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over USB Remote NDIS Devices and Windows

16

("*Microsoft*") further in view of Non-Patent Literature USB Host to Host Links ("*Brownell*"), U.S. Patent Publication Number 2003/0208579 A1 ("*Brady*"), and U.S. Patent Number 6,061,692 ("*Thomas*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Microsoft* further in view of *Brownell*, *Brady*, and *Thomas* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claims 2 – 3, 14 – 15, and 24 – 26. However, Applicants cancel these claims, thus rendering this issue moot.

C. Claims 4, 16, and 27 are Allowable Over *Microsoft* further in view of *Brownell, Brady, and Thomas* and further in view of *Cromer*

The Office Action indicates that claims 4, 16, and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable USB Remote NDIS Devices and Windows ("*Microsoft*") further in view of Non-Patent Literature USB Host to Host Links ("*Brownell*"), U.S. Patent Publication Number 2003/0208579 A1 ("*Brady*"), and U.S. Patent Number 6,061,692 ("*Thomas*") and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,532,497 B1 ("*Cromer*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Microsoft* further in view of *Brownell*, *Brady*, and *Thomas* further in view of *Cromer* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claims 4, 16, and 27. However, Applicants cancel these claims, thus rendering this issue moot.

D. Claims 5, 17, and 28 are Allowable Over *Microsoft* further in view of *Brownell, Brady, Thomas* and further in view of *Wallach*

The Office Action indicates that claims 5, 17, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable USB Remote NDIS Devices and Windows ("*Microsoft*") further in view of Non-Patent Literature USB Host to Host Links ("*Brownell*"), U.S. Patent Publication Number 2003/0208579 A1 ("*Brady*"), and U.S. Patent Number 6,061,692 ("*Thomas*") and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,170,028 ("*Wallach*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Microsoft* further in view of *Brownell*, *Brady*, and *Thomas*

17

further in view of *Wallach* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claims 5, 17, and 28. However, Applicants cancel these claims, thus rendering this issue moot.

E.   **Claims 8 – 9, 11 – 12, 19 – 20, 22 – 23, 31 – 32, 34 – 35, 37, and 39 - 40 is Allowable Over *Microsoft* further in view of *Brownell***

The Office Action indicates that claims 8 – 9, 11 – 12, 19 – 20, 22 – 23, 31 – 32, 34 – 35, 37 and 39 – 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable USB Remote NDIS Devices and Windows ("*Microsoft*") further in view of Non-Patent Literature USB Host to Host Links ("*Brownell*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Microsoft* further in view of *Brownell* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claims 8 – 9, 11 – 12, 19 – 20, 22 – 23, 31 – 32, 34 – 35, 37 and 39 – 40. However, Applicants cancel these claims, thus rendering this issue moot.

V.   **New Claims are Allowable**

A.   **Claim 41 is Allowable**

In addition, Applicants add new claim 41. New claim 41 is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that the cited art fails to disclose, teach, or suggest "receiving a second request from the host, in response to receiving an indication of *multiple support configurations*" as recited in new claim 41. More specifically, *Microsoft* discloses "USB ports exist on almost all new PCs and are natively supported in current versions of Windows. In addition to providing for external expansion and dynamic Plug and Play, USB allows devices to be self-describing" (page 1, paragraph "USB and Windows"). However, *Microsoft* fails to disclose "receiving a second request from the host, in response to receiving an indication of *multiple support configurations*" as recited in new claim 41. For at least this reason, new claim 41 is allowable.

18

Further *Brownwell* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Microsoft*. More specifically, *Brownwell* discloses "[t]his is for 'USB networking', connecting USB hosts as peers" (page 1, line 21). However, nowhere does *Brownwell* disclose "receiving a second request from the host, in response to receiving an indication of *multiple support configurations*" as recited in new claim 41.

Additionally, *Brady* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Microsoft* and *Brownwell*. More specifically, *Brady* discloses "determin[ing] whether the LRU configuration file has been received by the configuration server. Furthermore, if the LRU configuration file has not been received, the method further actuates the sending of a second instruction from the configuration file to the LRU to perform the generating step" (page 2, paragraph [0019]). However, nowhere does *Brownwell* disclose "receiving a second request from the host, in response to receiving an indication of *multiple support configurations*" as recited in new claim 41.

Further, *Thomas* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Microsoft*, *Brownwell*, and *Brady*. More specifically, *Thomas* discloses "[w]hen the information server was initialized, the information server would go the appropriate INI file, read the text-based information contained therein, parse the text-based information for extract the appropriate configuration information, and apply the configuration information. However, *Thomas* fails to disclose "receiving a second request from the host, in response to receiving an indication of *multiple support configurations*" as recited in claim 41. For at least these reasons, claim 41 is allowable.

B. Claim 46 is Allowable

In addition, Applicants add new claim 46. New claim 46 is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that the cited art fails to disclose, teach, or suggest "detecting a network device, the network device operating on a *first configuration*... [and] issuing a command enabling the network device to communicate on the universal serial bus according to a *second*

19

configuration" as recited in new claim 46. More specifically, *Microsoft* discloses "USB ports exist on almost all new PCs and are natively supported in current versions of Windows. In addition to providing for external expansion and dynamic Plug and Play, USB allows devices to be self-describing" (page 1, paragraph "USB and Windows"). However, *Microsoft* fails to disclose "detecting a network device, the network device operating on a *first configuration...* [and] issuing a command enabling the network device to communicate on the universal serial bus according to a *second configuration"* as recited in new claim 46. Additionally, the other cited references do not overcome the deficiencies of *Microsoft.* For at least this reason, new claim 46 is allowable.

C.   Claim 52 is Allowable

In addition, Applicants add new claim 52. New claim 52 is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that the cited art fails to disclose, teach, or suggest "a network adapter for returning a remote network drive interface specification configuration, the network adapter receiving a second request from a host, *when there is an indication of multiple support configurations"* as recited in new claim 52. More specifically, *Microsoft* discloses "USB ports exist on almost all new PCs and are natively supported in current versions of Windows. In addition to providing for external expansion and dynamic Plug and Play, USB allows devices to be self-describing" (page 1, paragraph "USB and Windows"). However, *Microsoft* fails to disclose "a network adapter for returning a remote network drive interface specification configuration, the network adapter receiving a second request from a host, *when there is an indication of multiple support configurations"* as recited in new claim 52. For at least this reason, new claim 52 is allowable.

Further *Brownwell* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Microsoft.* More specifically, *Brownwell* discloses "[t]his is for 'USB networking', connecting USB hosts as peers" (page 1,

20

line 21). However, nowhere does *Brownwell* disclose "a network adapter for returning a remote network drive interface specification configuration, the network adapter receiving a second request from a host, *when there is an indication of multiple support configurations*" as recited in new claim 52.

Additionally, *Brady* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Microsoft* and *Brownwell*. More specifically, *Brady* discloses "determin[ing] whether the LRU configuration file has been received by the configuration server. Furthermore, if the LRU configuration file has not been received, the method further actuates the sending of a second instruction from the configuration file to the LRU to perform the generating step" (page 2, paragraph [0019]). However, nowhere does *Brownwell* disclose "a network adapter for returning a remote network drive interface specification configuration, the network adapter receiving a second request from a host, *when there is an indication of multiple support configurations*" as recited in new claim 52.

Further, *Thomas* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Microsoft*, *Brownwell*, and *Brady*. More specifically, *Thomas* discloses "[w]hen the information server was initialized, the information server would go the appropriate INI file, read the text-based information contained therein, parse the text-based information for extract the appropriate configuration information, and apply the configuration information. However, *Thomas* fails to disclose "a network adapter for returning a remote network drive interface specification configuration, the network adapter receiving a second request from a host, *when there is an indication of multiple support configurations*" as recited in claim 52. For at least these reasons, claim 52 is allowable.

D. Claim 57 is Allowable

In addition, Applicants add new claim 57. New claim 57 is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that the cited art fails to disclose, teach, or suggest "a detecting component configured to detect a network device communicating via a first configuration, and

21

for issuing a universal serial bus reset to a network device by a host, and resetting a state of

the network device, and for receiving a network device at a universal serial bus port... [and] a

first issuing component configured to issue a command enabling the network device to

communicate on the universal serial bus via a second configuration" as recited in new claim 57.

More specifically, *Microsoft* discloses "USB ports exist on almost all new PCs and are natively

supported in current versions of Windows. In addition to providing for external expansion and

dynamic Plug and Play, USB allows devices to be self-describing" (page 1, paragraph "USB

and Windows"). However, *Microsoft* fails to disclose "a detecting component configured to

detect a network device communicating via a ***first configuration***, and for issuing a universal

serial bus reset to a network device by a host, and resetting a state of the network device, and

for receiving a network device at a universal serial bus port... [and] a first issuing component

configured to issue a command enabling the network device to communicate on the universal

serial bus via a ***second configuration***" as recited in new claim 57. Additionally, the other cited

references do not overcome the deficiencies of *Microsoft*. For at least this reason, new claim

57 is allowable.

E. Claim 63 is Allowable

In addition, Applicants add new claim 63. New claim 63 is allowable over the cited art

for at least the reason that the cited art fails to disclose, teach, or suggest "a second receiving

component configured to receive a second request from a host, ***when there is an indication***

of multiple support configurations" as recited in new claim 63. More specifically, *Microsoft*

discloses "USB ports exist on almost all new PCs and are natively supported in current versions

of Windows. In addition to providing for external expansion and dynamic Plug and Play, USB

allows devices to be self-describing" (page 1, paragraph "USB and Windows"). However,

Microsoft fails to disclose "a second receiving component configured to receive a second

22

request from a host, *when there is an indication of multiple support configurations*" as recited in new claim 63. For at least this reason, new claim 63 is allowable.

Further *Brownwell* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Microsoft*. More specifically, *Brownwell* discloses "[t]his is for 'USB networking', connecting USB hosts as peers" (page 1, line 21). However, nowhere does *Brownwell* disclose "a second receiving component configured to receive a second request from a host, *when there is an indication of multiple support configurations*" as recited in new claim 63.

Additionally, *Brady* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Microsoft* and *Brownwell*. More specifically, *Brady* discloses "determin[ing] whether the LRU configuration file has been received by the configuration server. Furthermore, if the LRU configuration file has not been received, the method further actuates the sending of a second instruction from the configuration file to the LRU to perform the generating step" (page 2, paragraph [0019]). However, nowhere does *Brownwell* disclose "a second receiving component configured to receive a second request from a host, *when there is an indication of multiple support configurations*" as recited in new claim 63.

Further, *Thomas* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Microsoft*, *Brownwell*, and *Brady*. More specifically, *Thomas* discloses "[w]hen the information server was initialized, the information server would go the appropriate INI file, read the text-based information contained therein, parse the text-based information for extract the appropriate configuration information, and apply the configuration information. However, *Thomas* fails to disclose "a second receiving component configured to receive a second request from a host, *when there is an indication of multiple support configurations*" as recited in claim 63. For at least these reasons, claim 63 is allowable.

23

F.   **Claim 68 is Allowable**

In addition, Applicants add new claim 68. New claim 68 is allowable over the cited art

for at least the reason that the cited art fails to disclose, teach, or suggest "a universal serial

bus port configured to receive a network device according to a *first configuration*... [and] a

second issuing component configured to issue a command to enable the network device to

communicate on the universal serial bus according to a *second configuration*" as recited in

new claim 68. More specifically, *Microsoft* discloses "USB ports exist on almost all new PCs

and are natively supported in current versions of Windows. In addition to providing for external

expansion and dynamic Plug and Play, USB allows devices to be self-describing" (page 1,

paragraph "USB and Windows"). However, *Microsoft* fails to disclose "a universal serial bus

port configured to receive a network device according to a *first configuration*... [and] a second

issuing component configured to issue a command to enable the network device to

communicate on the universal serial bus according to a *second configuration*" as recited in

new claim 68. Additionally, the other cited references do not overcome the deficiencies of

Microsoft. For at least this reason, new claim 68 is allowable.

G.   **Claim 74 is Allowable**

In addition, Applicants add new claim 74. New claim 74 is allowable over the cited art

for at least the reason that the cited art fails to disclose, teach, or suggest "one or more

instructions for issuing a universal serial bus reset to the network device by the host, the

network device operating to a first configuration... [and] one or more instructions for enabling

the network device to communicate on the universal serial bus according to a second

configuration" as recited in new claim 74. More specifically, *Microsoft* discloses "USB ports

exist on almost all new PCs and are natively supported in current versions of Windows. In

addition to providing for external expansion and dynamic Plug and Play, USB allows devices to

24

be self-describing" (page 1, paragraph "USB and Windows"). However, *Microsoft* fails to disclose "one or more instructions for issuing a universal serial bus reset to the network device by the host, the network device operating to a ***first configuration...*** [and] one or more instructions for enabling the network device to communicate on the universal serial bus according to a ***second configuration***" as recited in new claim 74. Additionally, the other cited references do not overcome the deficiencies of *Microsoft*. For at least this reason, new claim 74 is allowable.

H. Claims 42 – 45, 47 – 51, 53 – 56, 58 – 62, 64 – 67, 69 –73, 75 – 78 are Allowable

In addition, Applicants add new claims 42 – 45, 47 – 51, 53 – 56, 58 – 62, 64 – 67, 69 – 73, and 75 – 78. Dependent claims 42 – 45 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claim 41. Dependent claims 47 – 51 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claim 46. Dependent claims 53 – 56 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that they depend from allowable independent claim 52. Dependent claims 58 – 62 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claim 57. Further, dependent claims 64 – 67 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that they depend from allowable independent claim 63. Dependent claims 69 – 73 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claim 41. Dependent claims 75 – 78 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claim 74.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or addressed, and that the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested.

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and Official Notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well-known for the particular and specific reasons that the claimed combinations are too complex to support such conclusions and because the Office Action does not include specific findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

_____/afb/_____
Anthony F. Bonner Jr. Reg. No. 55,012

THOMAS, KAYDEN,
 HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.
Suite 1500
600 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500